Order Re Contempt (ECF No. 49) filed in Oracle USA, Inc. v. SAP AG

AARON D. FORD, ESQ. (NSBN 7704) JOHN A. HUNT, ESQ. (NSBN 1888) 1 BERT WUESTER JR., ESQ. (NSBN 5556) SNELL & WILMER LLP 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1100 FOX ROTHSCHILD, LLP Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 500 Email: aford@swlaw.com Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 Telephone: (702) 784-5265 Email: jhunt@foxrothschild.com Facsimile: (702) 784-5252 Email: bwuester@foxrothschild.com 4 Ph. (702) 262-6899; fax (702) 597-5503 MICHAEL B. LEVIN, ESQ. 5 JONATHON M. JACOBSON, ESQ. BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI 6 GEOFFREY M. HOWARD (SBN 157468) LUCIA MACDONALD (SBN 233028) 650 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, California 94304-1050 CHAD RUSSELL (SBN 246046) Three Embarcadero Center Telephone: (650) 493-9300 Facsimile: (650) 565-5100 San Francisco, CA 94111-4067 8 Telephone: (415) 393-2000 Attorneys for Non-Parties Facsimile: (415) 393-2286 RIMINI STREET INC. and SETH RAVIN 10 DORIAN DALEY (SBN 129049) JENNIFER GLOSS (SBN 154227) 11 500 Oracle Parkway, M/S 5op7 Redwood City, CA 94070 12 Telephone: (650) 506-4846 Facsimile: (650) 506-7114 13 dorian.daley@oracle.com jennifer.gloss@oracle.com 14 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 15 ORACLE USA, INC., et al. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 16 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 17 18 ORACLE USA, INC, a Colorado CASE NO.: 2:09-CV-01591 KJD (GWF) 19 Corporation, et. al., Pending in CASE NO.: 07-CV-01658 PJH 20 Plaintiffs, (EDL) (N.D. Cal.) 21 VS. STIPULATION AND ORDER FINDING NON-PARTIES SAP AG, a German corporation, et. al., 22 RIMINI STREET, INC. AND SETH RAVIN IN CIVIL CONTEMPT 23 Defendants. 24 25 26 27 28 Case No. 2:09-CV-01591 KJD (GWF)

Case 2:10 cvv 001066 LPtH-VATE Document 19199118 Filed 102127119 Page 2016 Case 2:09-cv-01591-KJD-GWF Document 49 Filed 01/12/10 Page 1 of 5

. 4	Case 2:09-cv-01591-KJD-GWF Document 49 Filed 01/12/10 Page 2 of 5
1	WHEREAS, on August 21, 2009, Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., et al. ("Oracle") filed their
2	Motion to Compel Non-Party Seth Ravin ("Mr. Ravin") to Answer Deposition Questions, and to
3	Compel Non-Party Rimini Street, Inc. ("Rimini Street") (collectively, the "Non-Parties") to
4	Produce Documents in Response to Oracle's Subpoena in the United States District for the
5	District of Nevada (Docket #1);
6	WHEREAS, the Non-Parties opposed Oracle's Motion to Compel on September 14, 2009
7	(Docket #26);
8	WHEREAS, Magistrate Judge George F. Foley, Jr. granted in part and denied in part
9	Oracle's Motion to Compel on October 13, 2009 (Docket #38) ("Judge Foley's Order");
10	WHEREAS, the Non-Parties filed timely Objections to Magistrate Judge Foley's Report
11	and Recommendations with the Court on October 27, 2009 (Docket #39);
12	WHEREAS, the Court denied the Non-Parties' Objections on November 25, 2009
13	(Docket #43) ("Judge Dawson's Order") (collectively, with Judge Foley's Order, "the Orders");
14	WHEREAS, the Non-Parties believe they have meritorious grounds to appeal the Orders;
15	WHEREAS, the Non-Parties believe the only available avenue for appeal of the Orders is
16	from an order of contempt for refusal to comply with the Orders;
17	WHEREAS, in light of the above, the Non-Parties have refused to comply with the
18	Orders;
19	WHEREAS, on December 22, 2009, Oracle filed an application for an order to show
20	cause why the Non-Parties should not be held in contempt of court (Docket #44), requesting
21	sanctions in the amount of \$15,803.50 and any other relief the Court deems appropriate and just;
22	WHEREAS, while the Non-Parties wish to avoid unnecessary motion practice, and are
23	unwilling to waive what they contend is their right to appeal this Stipulation and Order and the
24	underlying Orders, the Non-Parties are willing to stipulate to a finding of civil contempt for
25	refusal to comply with the Orders, in the form of the present Stipulation and Order (as set forth

below) for purposes of establishing what they contend is an avenue for appellate review.

26

27

28

WHEREAS, Defendants in the underlying litigation have requested to file a brief in connection with the appeal of this Stipulation and Order, and Oracle disagrees that Defendants have any basis or right to do so but has agreed with Non-Parties, in the interest of maintaining the expedited briefing schedule on appeal set forth below and without waiving any rights to challenge Defendants' standing or basis to participate in the appeal, that Defendants may file a brief on appeal, as specified in paragraph 8 below.

THEREFORE, the parties stipulate, and the Court finds, that:

- 1. The Non-Parties have refused to comply with the Orders.
- 2. The Non-Parties are hereby found to be in civil contempt of the Orders.
- 3. As the sole sanction for such contempt, the Non-Parties shall stipulate to the Order of Contempt as set forth herein, and pay Oracle's attorneys' fees in the amount of \$15,803.50.
- 4. Non-Parties' obligation to pay the fees awarded in this Stipulation and Order shall be stayed until the earlier of (a) ten (10) days after this Stipulation and Order is entered by the Court, if no appeal of this Stipulation is filed by such date; or (b) ten (10) days following issuance of the mandate from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit following an appeal of this Stipulation and Order and the Orders; or (c) ten (10) days after dismissal of any appeal from this Stipulation and Order and the Orders. Even if such stay extends until or beyond trial of the underlying action (*Oracle Corporation et al. v. SAP AG et al.*, Case No. 4:07-cv-01658-PJH (N.D. Cal.)), the Non-Parties shall remain obligated to pay the sanction.
- 5. Nothing in this Stipulation and Order shall result in a waiver of any right of the Non-Parties that otherwise exists to appeal this Stipulation and Order of contempt and the Orders.
- 6. Oracle agrees that it will not seek to dismiss Non-Parties' appeal of this Stipulation and Order, provided that Non-Parties comply with paragraph 7 below.
- 7. Oracle and Non-Parties will cooperate to take all reasonable steps, and file all necessary papers, to request expedited briefing and hearing of Non-Parties' appeal. To that end, Oracle and Non-Parties will request the Court of Appeals to order that Non-Parties' opening

	Case 2:09-cv-01591-KJD-GWF Document 49 Filed 01/12/10 Page 4 of 5
1	brief be due April 1, 2010; Oracle's brief be due April 25, 2010; Non-Parties' reply brief be due
2	May 10, 2010; and the appeal be argued the week of July 12-16, 2010 (or argued August 2-6,
3	2010, if trial of the underlying action is continued). Non-Parties will file their Notice of Appeal
4	within 10 (ten) days after the Court enters this Stipulation and Order. Oracle and Non-Parties
5	will use their best efforts to stipulate as to the portions of the transcript Non-Parties intend to
6	order within 7 (seven) days after the notice of appeal is filed. Non-Parties will file in court the
7	transcript designation form 7 (seven) days after Notice of Appeal is filed. Non-Parties will
8	arrange for expedited preparation of the record by the court reporter. Oracle and Non-Parties
9	will stipulate that the Court of Appeals' mandate issue on shortened time, if needed to cause the
10	mandate to issue by October 7, 2010.
11	8. The parties have agreed that Defendants' brief is due 7 days from the filing date
12	of Non-Parties' brief (by April 8, 2010), and Defendants' brief will be limited to 7000 words. In
13	the event Defendants file a brief as set forth above, Non-Parties will not oppose any motion by
14	Oracle requesting an enlargement of its brief by 4200 words, or, if no such motion is filed, Non-
15	Parties will stipulate to Oracle's request for an enlargement of its brief by 4200 words.
16	
17	Dated: January 8, 2010 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
18	Professional Corporation
19	By: /s/ Michael B. Levin
20	By: <u>/s/ Michael B. Levin</u> MICHAEL B. LEVIN
21	Attorneys for Non-Parties SETH RAVIN AND RIMINI STREET, INC.
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

y	Case 2:09-cv-01591-KJD-GWF Document 49 Filed 01/12/10 Page 5 of 5
1	
2	BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
3	By /c/ Geoffrey M. Howard
4	By: <u>/s/ Geoffrey M. Howard</u> GEOFFREY M. HOWARD
5	Attorneys for Plaintiffs ORACLE USA, Inc., et. al.
6	
7	
8	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.
9	DATED: January 12, 2010
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	
12 13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	